DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 502 SP 027 923

AUTHOR Jones, Donald W.
TITLE Successful Teacher Education Programs Depend upon Strong Cooperative Relationships between Public/Private Schools and Colleges and Universities.
INSTITUTION Coalition of Teacher Education Programs.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 45p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Cooperative Programs; *Field Experience Programs; Glossaries; Higher Education; *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses several issues which relate to the need for institutions of higher education to develop, implement, and sustain positive cooperative relationships with public and private schools in matters affecting contemporary teacher education programs. Areas such as curriculum development, instructional improvement, administrative decision making, research development, student assessment, general management, and overall school operation have witnessed varying amounts of cooperation between schools and colleges. The primary focus of this paper is directed to one area which depends extensively on positive and effective cooperative relationships--Professional Laboratory Experiences. Specifically, the paper addresses the necessity for professional laboratory experiences to become a critical vehicle for enhancing meaningful relationships between the training arm of the teaching profession and the real world of educational practice. Eleven questions are raised and organized into the following categories: (1) defining the territory; (2) the nature of experiences provided for teacher education students; (3) personnel considerations impinging on cooperative efforts; and (4) persistent concerns facing teacher educators. Recommendations are offered for better cooperative action by the Indiana Department of Education, higher education faculty who supervise laboratory experiences, and university members of COTEP (Coalition of Teacher Education Programs). A five-page list of references and a glossary are provided. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272502

SUCCESSFUL TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS DEPEND UPON STRONG COOPERATIVE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PUBLIC/PRIVATE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

by

Donald W. Jones

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D.W. Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Coalition of Teacher Education Programs
Indiana University
1985

SP027923

This paper was commissioned by the Coalition of Teacher Education Programs, a cooperative project to improve teacher education involving Ball State University, Butler University, Indiana University, Indiana State University, Purdue University, and the University of Evansville.

SUCCESSFUL TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS
DEPEND UPON STRONG COOPERATIVE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN
PUBLIC/PRIVATE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

INTRODUCTION

The following paper will address several issues which relate to the need for institutions of higher education to develop, implement, and sustain positive cooperative relationships with public and private schools in matters affecting contemporary teacher education programs. There are many instances in which cooperative, reciprocal activities have been initiated in the past. Areas such as curriculum development, instructional improvement, administrative decision making, research development, student assessment, general management, and overall school operation have witnessed varying amounts of cooperation between schools and colleges. Indeed, in some instances cooperative agreements are absolutely necessary. The primary focus of this paper will be directed to one area which depends extensively on positive and effective cooperative relationships - Professional Laboratory Experiences. Specifically, the paper will address the necessity for professional laboratory experiences to become a critical vehicle for enhancing meaningful relationships between the training arm of the teaching profession and the real world of educational practice.

Beginning with the early historical developments of organized teacher training by such pioneers as Comenius in 1657 and Father Charles Demia in Lyonne, France in 1672 (Kane, 1935 and Meyer, 1965) and the important contributions of Baptiste de la Salle, who founded the Brothers of the Christian Schools in 1674 and who wrote a book on organizing schools and teaching (Good and Teller, 1960) concern was expressed for improving the quality of teachers. Later historical developments, including (a) the development of teacher training schools in Switzerland and Germany (Pestalozzi, Froebel, Herbart, Francke); (b) the early workshops and institute programs in New England (Mann, Hall, Carter, Barnard); (c) the birth, rise, the demise of normal schools; (d) the transition of state teachers colleges to state universities; and (e) the recent national concerns for the quality of teachers, have witnessed a consistent interest that those choosing to become teachers should have had some direct involvement in teaching as a training procedure. A careful analysis of the historical development of teacher preparation would reveal a constantly increasing dependence on carefully designed and precisely implemented laboratory experience programs as a part of teacher education. This well-documented trend has paralleled the general increase in society's expectations that schools and teachers accept significantly expanding responsibilities.

As one examines the current status of teacher education with an eye to the future, it is equally apparent that professional laboratory experiences will be expected to play an increasingly significant role. One need only examine recent curriculum proposals which recommend extended preparation to include a fifth or sixth year of involvement to learn that increased dependence on professional clinical experiences is an essential element in all such extended programs.

The following paper will focus on the necessity and possibility for cooperative development and practice in the laboratory experience segment of teacher education - cooperative efforts which provide for quality control. Eleven questions are raised, and they have been organized into four categories as follows:

Defining the Territory

1. To what extent are definitions and terms used in professional laboratory experiences consistent?

2. Early and continuing contact with "real schools" and "real students": what has been the impact thus far?

The Nature of Experiences Provided for Teacher Education Students

3. How can well-planned multiple experiences best be provided for the varying assignments? From early observations to in-depth student teaching, the specific expectations should differ widely.

4. How can the issues of intensity of experience, breadth of experience, depth of experience, and duration of experience best be resolved and communicated?

5. How can professionally sound and acceptable methods to evaluate the actual, expected, and required performance of teaching behaviors best be developed? To what extent does this task call for cooperative work?

Personnel Considerations Impinging on Cooperative Efforts

6. Are there adequate numbers of professionally committed and specifically prepared supervisors available at the school level and in the universities to ensure excellence in the several early laboratory experiences as well as the full-time student teaching assignments?

7. Is it possible and desirable to develop a system of shared supervisory responsibilities among COTEP institutions?

8. Role responsibilities in laboratory experiences: what preparation should be required of school-based supervisors.

9. Should standards which are similar to those applied to school-based supervisors be required of clinical supervisors at the colleges and universities?

Persistent Concerns Facing Teacher Educators

10. Is there a need for special clinical or experimental schools which focus on research and program development?

11. Could an "entry-year program" contribute to stronger cooperative efforts between colleges and universities and the schools throughout Indiana?

In the following four sections of the report, each of the eleven questions will be examined and discussed briefly with regard to cooperative efforts between higher education and the schools which are served. Several sub-issues will be considered which relate to the implementation of new initiatives or changes in expectations.

A final section of the paper will address a few of the questions in greater detail by presenting proposals that may lead to altered expectations and practice.

SECTION I

DEFINING THE TERRITORY

1. To what extent are definitions and terms used in professional laboratory experiences consistent?

2. Early and continuing contact with "real schools" and "real students": what has been the impact thus far?

To What Extent Are Definitions and Terms Used in Professional Laboratory Experiences Consistent?

One of the difficulties that has plagued the education profession has been a lack of consistent professional terminology. The absence of a uniform terminology has caused considerable misunderstanding among professionals, the general public, and legislative decision makers. Individual states have developed policies and publications; teacher education professionals have written a plethora of books, articles, and professional publications; and national associations have developed numerous guidelines and position statements regarding professional laboratory experiences. Yet, uniformity in vocabulary has not emerged. In its recent efforts to achieve redesign, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) again found the difficulty to be apparent. In order to develop consistency of terminology as it relates to matters associated with national accreditation, a glossary of terms was developed for implementation with new accreditation standards.

There are eight terms included in the AACTE glossary that are relevant to this paper (NCATE Redesign, 1985).

1. Practicum Experiences: Opportunities which are provided to allow students to experience actual application of professional skills and knowledge. Included are direct, real experiences and simulated activities. Frequently referred to as Laboratory Experiences, Field Experiences, Clinical Experiences, Student Teaching and Internships.

2. Campus-Based Experiences: Those practicum experiences which are provided on the campus of a higher education institution. Includes simulation activities, learning laboratories, microteaching clinics, demonstration centers, laboratory schools, other technologically related experiences.

3. Field-Based Experiences: Those practicum experiences which are conducted at a school site or at an administrative center, a school clinic, or an appropriate community agency. Planning is shared by the professional education unit and the appropriate agency.

4. Clinical Experiences: Practicum experiences which are characterized by careful planning, stipulated goals, required activities, projected performance levels, and evaluation of growth. Includes microteaching clinics, participation experiences, skill clinics, student teaching, internships. Are conducted both as school-based and campus-based experiences. Activities not meeting the criteria for clinical experiences might include general observations, voluntary community service, orientation visits, teacher aiding, periodic visitations to educational settings.

5. Early Practicum Experiences: May be clinical as well as non-clinical. For undergraduate programs, both school-based and campus-based experiences which occur prior to the full-time student teaching assignment. For graduate students, those experiences which occur prior to an in-depth culminating direct experience requirement.

6. Student Teaching: An in-depth, direct clinical laboratory experience conducted in a school setting. Considered a culminating clinical experience for the basic teacher preparation program. NCATE criteria stipulate that the full-time assignment will be for at least ten weeks and that the experience shall be supervised both by a college-based supervisor and by a school-based supervisor.

7. School-Based Supervisor: A professionally certified practitioner who provides on-site clinical supervision and direction for college/university students during the field-based laboratory assignments. Frequently termed cooperating teacher or cooperating supervisor. Must be certified and experienced in the area in which clinical supervision is provided.

8. Supervisor of Clinical and Field-Based Experience: The college or university faculty member(s) assigned to supervise clinical and field-based experiences for basic and/or advanced programs.

The definitions accepted by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education represent a positive step toward clarification of roles, responsibilities, and the positions of individuals who must cooperate to bring about a stronger teaching profession. In the past, actions spearheaded by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and later included in accreditation terminology have had a significant impact on our profession. Particular reference is made to "multicultural education", "bilingual education", and "governance". It is anticipated that the total NCATE Glossary may serve to assist us in standardizing essential terminology relating to teacher education. With this in mind it is believed that efforts should be made to incorporate the above eight terms into the nomenclature used in proposals, programs, policies, and legislation relating to professional laboratory experiences.

Early and Continuing Contact with "Real Schools" and "Real Students" in Indiana: What Has Been the Impact Thus Far?

Many institutions in the state of Indiana were among the pioneer schools to have included direct laboratory experiences prior to student teaching. In fact, the existence of laboratory schools at Ball State University, Indiana State University, and Indiana University/Bloomington provided rich opportunities for early contacts. As the State Teacher Training and Licensing Commission of the Indiana Department of Public Instruction worked to revise certification standards (Commission on Teacher Training and Licensing,1976) one area which gained considerable attention was early and continuing laboratory experiences. Throughout the deliberations leading to the adoption of Teacher Education and Certification Handbook (TEACH) Rules 46 and 47, strong support for the inclusion of additional required laboratory experiences came from all areas of the profession. Not only are references made to early continued laboratory experiences throughout the description of each of the certification program areas, but an introductory statement is contained in the description of professional education. "Laboratory experiences shall

be initiated as soon as possible and continued throughout the student's program of preparation" (TEACH: Rules 46 and 47, 1976).

As Indiana institutions sought to prepare for adjustments in their teacher education programs that would include the early and continued experiences in schools, much concern was expressed regarding the nature of the experiences, the quality of supervision to be provided, the availability of appropriate assignments, financial demands associated with early experiences, and a host of other items. On two occasions the annual Turkey Run Teacher Education Workshop provided opportunities for representatives from virtually every teacher training institution in Indiana to discuss potential difficulties and to share proposed methods of accomplishing the intentions of the Teacher Training and Licensing Commission and the Indiana Department of Public Instruction as contained in Rule 46-47 TEACH.

The expectation that it would be necessary to engage in cooperative developments with public schools was shared by many teacher educators. It was immediately apparent that the responsibility for implementation of early and continuing experiences rested with institutions of higher education. Without direct involvement and cooperative efforts with school systems, however, such programs could not come to fruition.

In an attempt to provide additional background information to answer the above question, a cursory examination of the current status of early laboratory experiences was completed using telephone interviews as a basis for gathering data. Attempts were made to contact each of the more than 40 institutions that are approved to prepare teachers in Indiana. At the time of this writing, approximately 80% of the approved institutions have been contacted. While there certainly is not unanimity of opinion regarding our Indiana experience, there clearly are trends which are interesting.

1. Additional financial responsibility has not been overwhelming.

2. Cooperation from public schools that serve institutions of higher education has been evident. With a few exceptions, adequate numbers of classrooms have been made available.

3. On most campuses, the necessity to include earlier and continued experiences has provided impetus for positive change in teacher education programs.

4. The required additional early and continuing experiences have stimulated innovative program development.

Areas which warrant further examination, and which relate to questions that follow in this paper, include the following concerns:

1. Has the inclusion of early experiences led teacher educators in Indiana to alter the expectations associated with early experiences and with the culminating student teaching experience?

2. Is it possible to continue to request greater involvement and commitment from public school teachers without providing increased financial remuneration? If such remuneration is desirable or necessary, who should accept the responsibility for financial support?

3. As we continue to expand and refine the expectations associated with early and continuing laboratory experiences, how can greater involvement in the planning and evaluation stages of these experiences be negotiated with the school-based supervisors?

4. What programmatic considerations must be addressed in order to ensure a close relationship between contemporary research on teaching effectiveness and programmatic expectations for early and continued experiences?

SECTION II

THE NATURE OF EXPERIENCES PROVIDED FOR TEACHER EDUCATION STUDENTS

3. How can well-planned multiple experiences best be provided for the varying assignments? From early observations to in-depth student teaching, the specific expectations should differ widely.

4. How can the issues of intensity of experience, breadth of experience, depth of experience, and duration of experience best be resolved and communicated?

5. How can professionally sound and acceptable methods to evaluate the actual, expected, and required performance of teaching behaviors best be developed? To what extent does this task call for cooperative work?

How Can Multiple Experiences Best Be Provided When Expectations for Each of the Varying Assignments Lack Clarity?

When reviewing the literature concerning practicum experiences, one soon becomes aware of two statements that highlight this question. At some point most authors comment that the practicum opportunities in which prospective teachers participate in a classroom are the most valuable learning experiences in the teacher preparation program (Evertsen et al., 1985; Nicklas et al., 1982; Husen, 1985; Cooper and Sadker, 1972). Similarly, it is consistently reported that such experiences should occur early and frequently (Husen, 1985; Cooper and Sadker, 1972). Attempting to maximize these strengths, many institutions use multiple laboratory assignments, which occur as preservice observations, participations, clinics, student teaching, and internships. The addition of such variety of experiences has brought with it concerns about whether we are using the experiences to the greatest benefit, especially in light of the varied levels of development and preparedness which the students demonstrate.

Arnold Gallegos, in 1972, offered a "ladder program" of teacher-learning activities in schools. The ladder contained built-in progress competency rungs, which directed students as they would progress toward more responsible experiences. One criterion for judging progress is the extent to which the students mature in the teaching act (Gallegos, 1972).

In a similar vein, Smith and Sagan (1975) offered "A Taxonomy for Planning Field Experiences", which proposed a progression of activities, moving from observation to teaching, based on the development of knowledge concerning the teaching profession. Concerns which must be addressed as multiple practicum experiences are developed include:

1. Continued assessment of the impact of each type of experience is essential, especially concerning attitudinal changes of the prospective teacher.

2. Further research must be aimed at developing means to identify the rate of developmental change that is needed to more easily implement a taxonomy of field experiences.

3. Teacher educators must become concerned with being able to document the impact of the school-based supervisor and of the university clinical supervisor in their roles in each component of the entire range of professional laboratory experiences.

4. Since there appears to be little uniformity in the specific goals and expectations which constitute the broad variety of practicum experiences, there is an accompanying lack of clearly defined role expectations for school-based supervisors. This condition has led to a lack of specific preparation for this assignment.*

---

*Discussed in greater detail in Section III of this report.

5. Cooperative planning of the goals and expectations associated with the full range of experiences to be included within the taxonomy is absolutely necessary. Because of the brevity of the assignments and the very limited commitment of personnel, pre-planning must be thorough and must include both school-based and university-based supervisors.

How Can the Issues of Intensity of Experience, Breadth of Experience, Depth of Experience, and Duration of Experience Best Be Resolved and Communicated?

In organizing the day-to-day activities that prepare the education student for the profession, colleges and universities must concern themselves not only with overall activity but with the very nature of each experience. "Simply knowing what students do in field experiences is insufficient. What is more important is knowing how students interpret and integrate such activities into a meaningful understanding of teaching" (Applegate, 1985). Such evaluation must not only consider the length of an experience (duration), but also the scope (i.e. intensity, breadth, and depth) of the activity must be taken into account.

Little research has been conducted in this area of concern. In James Johnson's national survey of student teaching, only seven of sixty-three questions may be construed as having a strong interest in the duration or scope of student teaching (Johnson, 1968). More recently, Abernathy et al., describe classroom discipline, unmotivated students, lecturing, and time management as stress issues for the student teacher (Abernathy et al., 1985). Duration was reviewed to see the correlation of hours in the classroom with an increase of validity of the prospective teacher's decision concerning career choice (Willems et al., 1983). Self-concept and profession choice were investigated by Covert and Clifton (Covert and Clifton, 1983).

Equal to the need for basic theoretical research is the necessity to conduct applied research. Fox noted that in education it is "intriguing... how seldom changes are based on the research, and how seldom the research stimulates change, or how seldom change is delayed until there is a research basis for deciding if and how change should occur" (Huling and Johnson, 1983). Research and application must proceed hand in hand, for we are in need of data that can provide direction for decisions about intensity, duration, depth, and variety and their impact on expected/desired outcomes. Too often we make professional program decisions which are based purely on hunches, past experiences, personal preferences, and ease of implementation.

Cooperation between the school and college partners can have an obvious impact on decisions relating to these variables. However, the potential for cooperative efforts among the COTEP member institutions holds great promise as a basis for identifying significant applied research efforts which can be used by each and every member.

Cooperation should be sought through inter-collegial activity. In this way, successful processes can be shared and spread for the benefit of the profession (Lanier, 1984).

How Can Professionally Sound and Acceptable Methods to Evaluate and Assess the Expected and Required Performance of Teaching Behaviors Best Be Cooperatively Developed?

For far too long there has been a marked difference in what is expected and evaluated during student teaching and what is expected and evaluated when one becomes a fully certified teacher. There are some obvious differences that relate to maturity and experience, but the teaching/learning environments are not greatly different. Much valuable research has been produced in the last decade regarding the evaluation of teacher behavior, and this knowledge should make its way into all segments of the profession. One very important place to do this is during the professional practicum experiences. This does not seem to be happening. In a recent review of research and literature Zimpher (1985) reported the following:

> Literature on student teaching is almost excessive, to the point where much is produced annually, creating a case of exponential redundancy. The great books which guide our current understanding of student teaching stem from the works of Mead (1930), Curtis and Andrews (1954), Stratemeyer and Lindsey (1958), and Andrews (1964), to name but a few; all seminal works in outlining the nature of how we conduct the capstone experience for prospective teachers. Iterations of the last decade have added little to that base, except for a clearer understanding of the complex political and legal pitfalls (Hazard et al., 1976 and 1977) of university-school collaboration (Lang et al., 1975). None of these citations would really be categorized as "research" on student teaching. Nonetheless, a recent ERIC search on the combined categories of "student teaching" and "field experiences" generated 1852 entries from 1966 to present. The result of a subsequent search, combining "field experience" with "student teacher supervisors" (and also the descriptor "college faculty") reduced the number of specifically related entries to 412 references.

The application of teacher education research that is directly related to teacher performance is essential to gain credibility for our profession. One of the most notable examples is Florida's continuing effort to identify and evaluate teacher behaviors in beginning teachers. Educators in that state have identified 121 specific teacher behaviors shown through research to have direct relation to student achievement and improved classroom conduct. This effort is documented in the publication, "Domains: Knowledge Base of the Florida Performance Measurement System (Wilson, 1983).

A recent study on the consistency of teacher behavior (Ayers, 1983) showed that over time there is stability in evaluations of teaching behaviors by administrators, students, and researchers. This had been an area of mixed results in studies done prior to the 1980's. The data of the Ayers study showed that this stability was true of graduates from the same institution and for a period of four years. The author concludes that teachers' styles are established early in their careers and that the entry level into

the profession is likely a predictor of success in the profession.

Further, instruments or methodologies for evaluating teacher behaviors must be evaluated for reliability in order for teacher education efforts to display credibility in their efforts to improve teacher quality. Pennsylvania State University (Gajar, 1983) has demonstrated that the objective evaluation of teacher performances can be shown as reliable.

Evaluations of beginning teachers and the use of a research-established basic-skills knowledge base for prospective teachers will assist in the improvement of our profession. North Carolina (Woolever, 1985) has developed a rating form, STPEF (State Teaching Performance Evaluation Form), which operationally defines teaching behaviors as those that are positively correlated with pupil achievement on standardized tests. This same form is used in the preservice environment to coordinate the learning of those behaviors.

Coker (1985) states that there is a need to integrate empirical findings with evaluation of teacher behaviors, and he presented two conceptual frameworks in which this might be accomplished - The Consortium for the Improvement of Teacher Evaluation and The Research and Development Center for Teacher Evaluation. These frameworks suggest a necessity for the inclusion of master teachers, supervisors, and administrators in the design of all evaluation schema which are to be used with preservice teachers.

Rolider et al. (1985) focused attention on behavioral problems and their prevention among teachers. Their conclusion was that "training teachers to engage in optimal teaching skills before they begin their teaching careers" was an effective way to prevent problems later. Further, this was comprehensively assisted by the use of effective feedback techniques to preservice teachers as they demonstrated skills in their coursework. Academic, relevant feedback correlated in this study to increased student achievement. Gitlin, Ogawa, and Rose (1984) propose a horizontal evaluation system that allows supervisors of student teachers to "go beyond an exchange of 'tricks of the trade' by helping student teachers develop a framework to reflect on practice and understand...their influence on students."

The very nature of the several practicum experiences that require assessments of student performance places considerable and very significant responsibilities with the school-based supervisors. The actual day-to-day observation, analysis, and evaluation must be done by the school-based supervisor. Then, too, the final assessments of a variety of required behaviors must be completed by these professionals. Cooperative planning should be considered essential.

SECTION III

PERSONNEL CONSIDERATIONS IMPINGING UPON COOPERATIVE EFFORTS

6. Are there adequate numbers of professionally committed and specifically prepared supervisors available at the school level and in the universities to ensure excellence in the several early laboratory experiences as well as the full-time student teaching assignments?

7. Is it possible and desirable to develop a system of shared supervisory responsibilities among COTEP institutions?

8. Role responsibilities in laboratory experiences: what preparation should be required of school based supervisors?

9. Should standards which are similar to those applied to school-based supervisors be required of clinical supervisors at the colleges and universities?

Are There Adequate Numbers of Professionally Committed and Specifically Prepared Supervisors Available at the School Level and in the Universities to Ensure Excellence in the Early Laboratory Experiences as Well as in the Full-Time Student Teaching Assignment?

The above question mirrors the concern of many inside and outside schools of education regarding the professional preparation of teachers, including the practicum and student teaching components. Teacher educators generally agree that supervised student teaching can be a powerful educational experience (Thies-Sprinthall, 1984). Unfortunately, some research studies point to the supervision process as a negative experience in terms of desired student outcomes. Tittle found that student teachers and college supervisors indicate that they perceive the cooperating teacher as more of a problem than the school groups do (Tittle, 1974). Part of this problem stems from the fact that the student teacher must conform to the school practices and traditional ways of teaching. As a result, student teachers often complete their experiences at lower stages of psychological development than the levels demonstrated at the outset of the assignment. Thies-Sprinthall (1974) cited the work of Zeichner, who found that "student teachers are more rigid, more authoritarian, less flexible, and less responsive to pupil needs at the conclusion of their training" (Zeichner, 1979).

It should be noted that there are also serious questions regarding the role and qualifications of the college supervisor. Bowman (1979) documented questionable practices of the typical college supervisor. (This issue is addressed in another section of this presentation.)

It appears that a stronger linkage between educational theory and practice must take place in the laboratory and student teaching experiences. Emans (1983) proposed changes in the relationship between cooperating teacher, student teacher, and the college supervisor. Kingen (1984) proposed changes in the methodology of selecting cooperating teachers. Wheeler and Ellerman (1982) proposed a model for collaborative inservice education. The October 1984 NASSP Bulletin spotlighted school/college connections and the features that make these programs successful. While the NASSP review did not examine laboratory experience assignments, the information presented is certainly germane.

It is not possible to separate the issue of quality and skill in supervision from that of numbers of teachers available. When even the most modest of expectations are applied, it appears that there exists a severe shortage of master teachers who are prepared to assume the role of a school-based clinical supervisor. A few of the underlying guidelines (some of which are addressed in greater detail elsewhere in this paper) follow:

1. After identification, the profession should provide special preparation for successful teachers who desire to serve as school-based supervisors. If the role is to assist in interpreting theory in practice, then continued expansion and clarification of contemporary thought should characterize the preparation, which will naturally focus on supervisory skills.

2. Establish systems of financial remuneration which recognize the expertise, the time, and the commitment that are demanded of school-based clinical supervisors.

3. Involve outstanding school-based teacher educators in meaningful cooperative program-development activities. Such involvement should include compensatory time, through the use of substitute teachers or altered teaching schedules.

4. From the earliest points of contact, future teachers should be asked to consider the school-based supervisor as a key person in the profession.

Is It Possible and Desirable to Develop a System of Shared Supervisory Responsibilities Among Cooperating Institutions of Higher Education?

The consortium seems to be the main vehicle used by institutions of higher education as they consider cooperation on supervision/practicum experiences. However, there exists a history of "no action taken" on this innovative idea due to lack of monies and limited institutional commitment to cooperative ventures. On numerous occasions this concept has been addressed in Indiana, with similar results. Autonomy is still the main priority of most teacher education programs (Coker, 1985; Jones and Barnes, 1984).

For example, a case study on seeking change in teacher education cited an attempt in California for one statewide cooperative effort at reform and innovation. The California Consortium on the Beginning Years of Teaching, with the aid of Dr. Robert N. Bush (retired from Stanford University), proposed an internship/residency model for teacher preparation. The consortium decided to establish cooperative programs. It was a high goal, but the only result was the establishment of the model between USC and the Los Angeles School District. The consortium faded away due to lack of monies for the innovation and shifts in interests by the individual institutions to other models of their own making (Jones and Barnes, 1984).

Most cooperative programs in teacher education practicum programs are between a higher education institution and public schools rather than among several higher education institutions. Gilman (1984) shares a bibliography of cooperative involvements that illustrates this and points out that few references note efforts between institutions of higher education.

Oregon and Louisiana do present examples, however. In Oregon both Oregon State University and Western Oregon State College have cooperated to establish a Quality Assurance Program that guarantees the abilities of their teacher education graduates (Barr, 1984). Its primary feature is to assure students, graduates, and employers of professional support for career-entry assistance and retraining. The ten-category program provides for this at no cost to their graduates. It is unique in the nation. The Louisiana cooperative venture is between the historically black and historically white institutions of Grambling State and Louisiana Tech Universities. (Mills, 1984) The Mills report is an evaluation of their first year of operation. They are conducting joint student teacher seminars with faculty exchanges coupled with follow-up activities. The effort so far seems to have been very successful for both the schools of education and for the students.

It appears that there does not exist an abundance of cooperative ventures occurring in the nation, regardless of the rhetoric. Some notable exceptions do exist, but they are few. What are the chances that the COTEP structure could serve as the foundation for a viable consortium for practicum experiences? Whether the similarities in emphasis, expectation, and staff requirements are sufficient to permit a successful venture among COTEP member schools is questionable. Of course the occasional "special assignment", which always has been accommodated, will remain. The inability of several prior efforts to obtain and sustain long-term financial stability is an important consideration. It is clear that combining forces should not be seen as a means to reduce the cost of providing high quality experiences for prospective teachers. Moreover, it is expected that institutional program autonomy and uniqueness, real or perceived, when coupled with the many administrative differences among institutions, will minimize the feasibility for widespread sharing of supervisory responsibilities. In fact, the need for teacher preparation units in institutions of higher education to identify their uniqueness and their emphasis or thrust is considered to be very important on most campuses.

Role Responsibilities in Laboratory Experiences: What Preparation Should Be Required of School-Based Supervisors?

In a recent book titled, Guiding Clinical Experiences in Teacher Education, Colden Garland carefully addresses and analyzes the roles which the key participants in professional laboratory experiences must assume. While Garland emphasizes student teaching experiences, his analysis and review are appropriate considerations regarding all practicum assignments. "In order to analyze role definitions, to determine areas of consensus and conflict, it is necessary first to identify the expectations that are held for the occupants of the interacting roles" (Garland, 1982). There have been numerous attempts to differentiate the roles played by the essential participants in laboratory experiences - the university clinical supervisor, the school-based supervisor, and the prospective teacher. While many teacher educators have addressed this issue, problems associated with role identification, professional expectations, and necessity for cooperative relationships frequently contribute to difficulties in planning and conducting valuable laboratory experiences. An appropriate document regarding this question was published by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in 1978. In this publication, Professional Roles for Teacher Educators, William H. Drummond predicted that every certified teacher would eventually be expected to acquire and be able to demonstrate the skills necessary to fill the role expectations of a cooperating teacher (Drummond, 1978).

As is true with most bodies of knowledge, the information that we have about teaching and teacher behavior is expanding rapidly. Practicing professionals frequently have little opportunity to acquire the latest information, technology, and teaching strategies. Recent developments within the last two decades have had a significant impact on teacher preparation. Among the many developments are (a) microteaching and technical skills, (b) simulation laboratories, (c) interaction analysis, (d) creativity in teaching, (e) humanistic classroom instruction, (f) mastery learning, (g) competency-based teacher education, and numerous others.

If the teaching profession is to continue to strive for status and effectiveness, there is no question that practicing professionals must play a major role. This can happen only if they are trained, if they are models of good practice, and if their contributions to teacher development are noteworthy. One haunting conjecture is that we are now devoting greater emphasis and increased amounts of time to school-based practicum experiences while tremendous criticism is being leveled at the low quality of existing professional practice. Required high-level preparation of school-based supervisors could help to alleviate this condition.

Should Standards Which Are Similar to Those Applied to School-Based Supervisors Be Required of Clinical Supervisors at Colleges and Universities?

Many believe that certification of university clinical supervisors should be required. At the present, however, forty-four states have no formal credentialing process for university clinical supervising teachers, and twenty-four have no legal requirements for serving as a school-based supervisor (Morris et al., 1984-85). Historically, the prerequisite for practicing a trade or profession has been certification or licensing that promoted an assurance of minimal competence, such as the examinations and licensing required for doctors or lawyers.

Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, supports this idea with his definition of a professional. To Shanker, the professional is a person who is an expert and is permitted to operate fairly independently (Shanker, 1985). All fifty states have certification requirements for teachers, but the college faculties who prepare the teachers are not required to meet any specific criteria to ensure that they have appropriate knowledge or skills to supervise in the teacher preparation programs.

If teachers lack professional status with the training backgrounds they have, how much professional stature can the university supervisor have if he or she has not been prepared under a program designed to meet specific certification or licensing standards? NCATE supports the need for a competent university faculty in teacher preparation programs, but the standards which exist are quite general (Watts, 1984). This leads to a great variance in the qualifications and skills of university clinical supervisors and in the practicum programs themselves.

Most clinical supervisors today are trouble-shooters who are reluctant to report anything but positive comments about student teaching performances (Applegate, 1985). There must be a move toward certification of both school-based supervisors and campus-based supervisors if the public and the profession are to be assured that teachers have the proper knowledge, skills, and abilities to practice in the profession. A certification system also could ensure the maintenance of professional skills by members throughout their careers. Certification also could eliminate the use of unqualified higher education faculty in this important assignment (Watts, 1984).

Certification is a necessity for building the public confidence and promoting better and more efficient teacher education programs and university supervision. It could standardize the programs and create an awareness of our efforts to improve quality. "We can ill afford more trial and error teacher education" (Applegate, 1985).

SECTION IV

PERSISTENT CONCERNS FACING TEACHER EDUCATORS

10. Is there a need for special clinical or experimental schools which focus on research and program development?

11. Could an entry-year program contribute to stronger cooperative efforts between colleges and universities and the schools throughout Indiana?

Is There a Need for Special Clinical or Experimental Schools Which Focus on Research and Program Development?

A desire for special school settings in the United States, i.e., laboratory schools, which focus on research and program development can be traced to the origins of the normal schools and most significantly to John Dewey and the University of Chicago Lab School, "the primary purpose" of which "was 'to further the appreciation of scientific concepts and methods of the conduct of school work' " (Page, 1982). Given this fact, however, research "has not been the primary focus of attention, with a few significant exceptions" in the overall history of such schools. Both "instruction of students [and] teacher education" are "more predominant" (Page, 1982).

There is a widely observed need for R & D settings. Both teachers and institutions apparently believe that research activities validate their existences (Copenhaver et al., 1982). Within this context, the call for research usually is complicated by specifics. There is an attitude of let's do this kind of research or let's do research this way (Milner and Reising, 1982), or let's do research in this setting (Krause, 1977). There is an attitude of reform at work that seeks to make research more relevant and viable. There is also a tendency to recommend action research or research in public school environments (Milner and Reising, 1982).

The need for research in workable conditions generally is not disputed. However, the traditional college-laboratory school relationship and the resultant research has been negatively characterized as limited and improperly motivated:

> Descriptive and experimental research projects are the most prevalent types produced. The primary source of available computer services for analysis of research data is located on the college/university campus, external of the laboratory school. Paper presentations, workshops, and monographs are most often utilized as channels for dissemination of research findings. Promotion, tenure, or continued employment are the most significant incentives for faculty participation in research projects. (Page, 1982)

Moreover, "there must be a bridging system between research-based knowledge and America's classrooms" (Woodruff, 1965).

Several model programs are either in planning or in place. One example is at the University of Hawaii, which recently totally redesigned its lab school at the College of Education at Manoa. The institution is now a research facility by all criteria including the required supportive hardware and internal structure, and research is the top priority (Krause, 1977). There is a need for special school settings for R & D; but both the institutions and the research need to reflect the best of contemporary thinking in terms of design, objectives, and instrumentation.

Included among the more pessimistic proponents of experimental schools are Sizer (1983) and Goodlad (1984), who suggest that such schools may constitute meaningful testing grounds for radically new school models and for essential research into innovative strategies. While not designed from the molds of past laboratory schools, several special-purpose schools, such as academies for gifted children or schools for the performing arts and others not fitting the definition of the comprehensive school, may be able to play special roles in teacher preparation programs.

Several of the COTEP member institutions currently have or have had laboratory schools. It seems obvious that one of the purposes of these schools has always been to share their unique experiences with the broader educational community. This is not an easy task to achieve. Shared research, joint planning, and enhanced inter-institutional communication among the COTEP schools might increase the value of the research and program development and also might lead to more widespread application to public and private schools with which the COTEP institutions cooperate.

Promising practices that have been initiated, tested, and reviewed at the laboratory schools might possibly be expanded and field tested in a wider base through COTEP sponsorship. A powerful link to sizable numbers of public and private elementary and secondary schools could be developed. Such leadership would expand the opportunities for cooperative curriculum efforts and also could exert a powerful positive influence on cooperative activities in teacher preparation.

Could an Entry-Year Program Contribute to Stronger Cooperative Efforts Between Colleges and Universities and the Schools Throughout Indiana?

The first few years of teaching have been found by many to be the most critical period in a teacher's career (Bush, 1966). Unfortunately, support of beginning teachers is lacking (Bouchard and Hull, 1970; Gorton, 1973; Ryan et al., 1980; Howey and Bents, 1980). "Many new teachers function in a professional desert, abandoned by the institutions where they received their pre-service education and neglected by overburdened school supervisory personnel" (Howsam et al., 1976). The first few years of teaching are typically a stressful time. Such early conditions have been found to lead to "increasing negativism and rigidity in the attitudes of many neophytes" (Laguna, 1970). As a result, many beginning teachers leave the profession.

"Entry-level" or "Induction" programs are designed to be cooperative efforts between teacher training institutions and schools to help the novice teacher through the difficult transition years. In addition, the carefully designed entry-year models have provided a much needed point for assessing the effectiveness of new teachers. The highly received Oklahoma plan was provided with funding to initiate a statewide effort. The University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, working with sixteen other teacher training institutions, developed an Entry Year Assistance Program to help alleviate some of the difficulties typically experienced by beginning teachers (Burke and Schmidt, 1984). This program has five major components and clearly delineates the role of the school district and the university in terms of funding, supervision, seminars, and resources. The Wisconsin program, like the Oklahoma

entry-level program, utilized experienced teachers as "mentors" for the neophyte teacher (McBee and Crawford, 1983). Tangible cooperative efforts (such as mentorships) help ensure continued articulation and communication among the public schools, the universities, and the governmental agencies responsible for teacher certification.

Most entry-year programs are young. Continued experience and review will provide more formative and summative evaluation. The comprehensive research-based FPMS, or Florida Performance Measurement System (Wilson, 1983), is the most long-lived program reviewed, the effort having begun in the early 1970's.

Predominantly, the entry-level programs reviewed are mandated by state statutes (e.g., Florida S. B. 338; Oklahoma H. B. 1706; and South Carolina Act 187). At the 1980 AACTE Annual Meeting in Dallas, Texas, a resolution was approved calling for assessment of basic skills for entry and continuance in teacher education programs, and assessment of professional skills as an exit requirement. It was further resolved that

> completion of a teacher education program should lead to initial certification with further certification dependent on cooperative evaluation of performance on the job. (Boardman and Butler, 1981)

In a call for quality cooperative efforts Denemark and Nutter have stated that design and implementation of "a comprehensive system of teacher education with properly delineated responsibilities for pre-service preparation, in-service education, and for continuing professional development" is essential (Denemark and Nutter, 1980). These calls are being heeded and, although the impetus did not come from them, legislatures have responded in several states.

Of the twenty-nine states that have taken some kind of teacher-assessment action since 1980, several have included some sort of postbaccalaureate fifth-year internship or probationary, temporary certification that deals with initial entry into the teaching profession. These include: Florida, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Vermont with one-year entry or internship programs; North Carolina with a two-year initial teacher program; and Georgia with a three-year nonrenewable certificate program.

Oklahoma's fifth-year internship, called the Entry-Year Assistance Program, establishes stringent supervision by a support committee for the beginning teacher. The committee is comprised of a consulting teacher, a principal, and a teacher educator. The committee members make recommendations regarding certification and a staff development program for the beginning teacher following their initial year (Simms, 1983). South Carolina's Education Improvement Act has a similar provisional year that requires three evaluations by a team of educators (Boardman and Butler, 1981). Vermont requires an adequately supervised one-year internship.

Competency-based teacher education programs have been encouraged in Georgia since the early 1970's, but no universal cooperative standardized effort seems to exist. The state does require that, after passing a criterion-referenced test, all beginning teachers will be assessed with the TPAI (Teacher Performance Assessment Instruments) during their three-year nonrenewable certification period (Boardman and Butler, 1981).

Florida statute, based on extensive teacher performance research compiled by the cooperative Florida Coalition for the Development of a Performance Evaluation System, mandates that beginning teachers must complete a one-year Florida Beginning Teacher Program before they are issued the initial regular teaching certificate, which is valid for five years. Further, the beginning teacher is required to keep a professional portfolio that includes a Beginning Teacher Handbook, evaluation checklists, etc. The portfolio is to be the documentation of the teacher's initial year and will be used for evaluation for certification by a support committee similar to the Oklahoma model. This program and system for evaluation is very comprehensive and detailed and the reader should contact the Florida Education Department for handbooks and evaluation tools used (Boardman and Butler, 1981; Wilson 1983).

Evidence of a most formal and serious cooperative effort at improving teacher quality was present in the North Carolina Entry-Year Program. Through a phone interview (1985), Dr. Shirley Haworth of the University of North Carolina-Greensboro School of Education reported that North Carolina places all teachers entering the profession in the state (experienced teachers moving in and beginning teachers) at the level of initially certified teachers. The North Carolina Entry-Level Program requires the keeping and upgrading of a professional portfolio and a two-year support period before being recommended for regular certification. This program just began in the fall, 1985. The support committee would be composed of the building principal and a mentor teacher. The third individual is optional and would be selected from teacher educators or someone in the central office of the school where the initially certified teacher is employed. Recommendations for certification are submitted to the district superintendent or to a certification panel established by state statute.

One of the significant developments at the University of North Carolina-Greensboro is the establishment of a formal agreement signed by all upper-level administrators in a two-county area that includes six colleges and universities and four public school districts. They have cooperatively agreed to continue assisting each other in the implementation of the state statute and are currently in Phase I of the implementation, which is the establishment of procedures that will prepare cooperating teachers to better handle student teachers and evaluate their performance, prepare mentor teachers, and start inservice workshops for this professional development. Dr. Haworth also shared that it looks like the state of North Carolina will be requiring the certification of cooperating teachers to supervise student teachers (Haworth phone conversation, 1985).

One goal of an entry-year induction program for Indiana would be to ensure continued contact of graduates with university personnel. It has been documented that new teachers rarely initiate any interaction with the university about their teaching (Grant and Zeichner, 1981). Such lack of contact puts the university "out of touch" with the realities of classroom life in the schools.

Another desirable outcome for Indiana would be the orientation of new teachers. It has been shown that beginning teachers need better orientation "in the areas of curricular materials and procedural information" (Grant and Zeichner, 1981) than do experienced teachers.

There are obvious similarities between professional teaching abilities and the required collateral supervisory skills that are necessary for master teachers who are asked to serve as student teaching supervisors. The similarities extend to teachers who serve as mentor teachers for entry-year programs, as directors of internships, or as supervisors of earlier school-based direct experiences.

An idea worth exploring with regard to entry-year programs for Indiana would be for the COTEP member institutions to enter into a three- or four-year experimental program with the Indiana Department of Education to implement and evaluate a pilot project whose major goal would be to assess the advantages and problems which would be associated with an Indiana Entry-Year Certification Plan. Such action would present an opportunity for statewide leadership, which could impact on several significant educational concerns. Meaningful cooperation has been noted as an essential condition in those entry-year programs begun thus far. Surely Indiana would not be different. It is possible to strengthen the bonds of interdependence through such basic cooperative endeavors.

SECTION V

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The State Board of Education of the Indiana Department of Education should establish and implement as soon as possible a certification program for School-Based Supervisors of teacher education students.

2. COTEP member schools should provide statewide leadership by adopting the requirements included in Recommendation #1. This action should not be delayed and should become effective with the beginning of the 1986-87 academic year.

3. All higher education faculty who are asked to serve in the capacity of a University Supervisor of Clinical and Field-Based Experiences should be required to meet minimum criteria of professional excellence.

4. Each COTEP member school should actively seek opportunities to expand on existing cooperative efforts in teacher education. Not only should cooperative planning and implementation be sought with public and private schools, but member schools should themselves engage in joint, cooperative attempts to improve the quality of laboratory experiences offered on the several university campuses.

5. As one possible means of achieving the preceeding recommendation, it is suggested that each COTEP member school establish a Cooperative Council for Professional Laboratory Experiences.

6. The structure of COTEP should be used as a basis for the establishment of an advisory group for teacher education with membership from each of the individual Cooperative Councils.

RECOMMENDATION #1

The State Board of Education of the Indiana Department of Education should establish and implement as soon as possible a certification program for School-Based Supervisors of teacher education students.

Rationale

1. Such certification previously existed in Indiana. It was discontinued when general requirements for the Professional License were altered.

2. The Association of Teacher Educators (1977-1978), after considerable study and research, recommended the establishment of certification standards.

3. The Teacher Education Advisory Council for the former Teacher Training and Licensing Commission approved a proposal calling for the establishment of a license. This proposal was never presented for action (1979).

4. Recent changes, which have eliminated a Professional Certificate and which no longer require additional formal graduate study, have exacerbated the problems which relate to significant changes in expectations for the continued professional development of Indiana teachers.

5. If there is a single place in the chain of professional personnel development which should be based on linkages forged from the highest expectations for demonstrated professional development and commitment, it is to be found in the classrooms where prospective members of the profession study, model, emulate, and experiment under the tutelage of "master" professionals who are trained as skilled clinical supervisors.

The Proposed Plan

Candidates will be qualified for the License: School-Based Supervisor in Teacher Education, when they have completed the following requirements.[1]

A. Hold a valid Indiana Teaching License.

B. Have completed an appropriate Master's Degree related to teaching in the areas of certification.

---

[1]All certified field-based programs which are used in lieu of graduate credit courses must be approved by the institution of higher education which will recommend the teacher for a School-Based Supervisor in Teacher Education certificate.

C. Have completed course work at the graduate level in Supervision in Teacher Education, which shall include but not be limited to supervisory skills, analysis of teaching behavior, goals and nature of various laboratory assignments, and research on teacher behavior (4 semester hours minimum)

OR

Have successfully participated in and completed field-based, inservice workshops, conferences, seminars, or other programs specifically designed to study and prepare teachers for School-Based Supervisor responsibilities (a minimum of 80 clock hours of certified, planned activities).

D. Be recommended by the building principal(s) in which the most recent three years of teaching experience have been completed.

E. Be recommended by the accredited institution offering the approved qualifying programs.

RECOMMENDATION #2

COTEP member schools should provide statewide leadership by adopting the requirements included in Recommendation #1, above. This action should not be delayed and should become effective with the beginning of the 1986-87 academic year.

Rationale

1. While it would be desirable to witness a State Department of Education mandate, the importance of this need is so great that cooperative action by COTEP member schools can provide the much needed leadership.

2. Such action will clearly illustrate a solid commitment by COTEP schools for increasing the significance and quality of student teaching.

3. When leading schools agree on such qualitative standards, the impact will be felt throughout Indiana.

The Proposed Plan

In order to be approved as a School-Based Supervisor in Teacher Education for any COTEP member school, the teacher must have been awarded a "COTEP Certificate of Achievement: School-Based Supervisor", which is based on the criteria cited above within Recommendation #1.

Complete reciprocity will be extended among COTEP member institutions. The criteria should be considered minimums; individual member schools may wish to exceed these standards.

RECOMMENDATION #3

All higher education faculty who are asked to serve in the capacity of a University Supervisor of Clinical and Field-Based Experiences should be required to meet minimum criteria of professional excellence.

Rationale

1. The literature cited in this paper provides clear evidence of the need for university personnel to play an active role as clinical supervisors.

2. The several field-based experiences necessitate skilled, informed, teacher education personnel who are trained to observe, to analyze, to interpret, and to prescribe on a professional basis.

3. The increasing dependence on the inclusion of a complete series of laboratory assignments makes even more important the role and expectations which are placed on university faculty who possess special clinical skills.

4. While basic and theoretical research are one important responsibility of a College of Education, clinical supervision of prospective professional practitioners must become recognized as a fundamental and important responsibility. Not only must regular faculty be selected who are skilled and knowledgeable regarding teacher education goals, but these faculty must also be able to conduct applied field-based research regarding many aspects of teaching/learning. Faculty who currently possess these broad and complex talents are scarce commodities.

5. Unless we in higher education are willing to require faculty to prepare for the demanding expectations of supervision, the public and private school teachers will not look with favor on requirements that they must be <u>better</u> prepared than their <u>cooperating</u> university supervisors.

The Proposed Plan

Faculty who are assigned to serve as a University Supervisor of Clinical and Field-Based Experiences should meet the following expectations:

A. Should hold or be eligible to hold a teaching license.

B. Should have taught in a public or private school, instructing students in grades K-12.

C. Should have completed a Master's Degree (a doctorate related to teacher preparation is desirable).

D. Should have completed teacher education coursework or faculty development activities equivalent to those recommended for the School-Based Supervisors.

E. Should maintain continuing contact with public and private elementary and secondary schools.

Faculty who meet these standards and who demonstrate quality performance shall be identified as a University Supervisor of Clinical and Field-Based Experiences. Such COTEP identification (or state certification) will authorize the faculty member to perform these tasks including conducting and directing applied research. Such faculty should be rewarded equally to all other graduate and undergraduate faculty at the university.

RECOMMENDATION #4

Each COTEP member school should actively seek opportunities to expand on existing cooperative efforts in teacher education. Not only should cooperative planning and implementation be sought with public and private schools, but member schools should themselves engage in joint, cooperative attempts to improve the quality of laboratory experiences offered on the several university campuses.

Rationale

1. Specific goals and objectives need to be identified for each of the several laboratory practicum experiences. The expertise of school-based supervisors is essential with regard to classroom expectations. School-based administrators must be included when educational goals and logistical matters are to be considered.

2. Joint planning is essential if there is to be shared responsibility for the establishment of high level criteria for judging the success of students who participate in pre-professional experiences.

3. Through well established two-way communication, an essential part of cooperative planning, both parties can grow and higher education personnel can maintain an understanding of the changing realities of teaching in schools. Simultaneously, public and private school teachers and administrators benefit from contact with state-of-the-art curriculum developments and from contact with recent research findings about teaching.

RECOMMENDATION #5

As one possible means of achieving the preceeding recommendation, it is suggested that each COTEP member school establish a Cooperative Council for Professional Laboratory Experiences.

Rationale

1. The primary goal will be to establish an official body whose fundamental purpose is to plan for a variety of professional clinical experiences. A guideline to direct activities is that the experiences must strive for the highest possible level of quality in learning. Both the higher education institutions and the public/private schools who participate will share in a reciprocal commitment to produce high quality new professionals.

2. Official recognition of the expertise and the effort provided by school-based supervisors of teacher education students can be achieved through actual appointment to the Council. The appointment of colleagues can provide a means of communicating ideas, concerns, and suggestions.

3. While the actual design and composition of each Council may differ, care should be taken to include representatives from a variety of cooperating school systems and from a variety of the professional practitioners who are involved in the total laboratory experiences.

Possible Membership for Cooperative Councils
for Professional Practicum Experiences

School-Base		Professional Assignment
System A	(2)	Elem Student Teacher Supervisor (school-based)
System A	(1)	Jr Hi/Mid School Principal (school-based)
Univ Fac	(1)	Elem Univ Clinical Prof
Univ Fac	(1)	Sec Univ Clinical Prof
Univ Stu	(1)	Sec Teacher Ed Stu
System B	(1)	Early Childhood School-Based Lab Exp Supervisor
System C	(1)	School Supt
System B	(1)	High School Stu Teacher Supervision
System C,C	(2)	Teachers who participate in "early exp program"
Univ Adm	(2)	Univ Lab Exp/Tea Ed Administrators

* Twelve members. (Membership should remain fluid so that many school-based supervisors have an opportunity to serve and so that membership can reflect the nature of the problems to be addressed.

RECOMMENDATION #6

The structure of COTEP should be used as a basis for the establishment of an advisory group for teacher education with membership from each of the individual Cooperative Councils

Rationale

1. The problems and issues that must be addressed regarding practicum experiences, as well as other elements of the total programs, are shared by all.

2. Sharing ideas, problems, and solutions to persistent and common items is an important way to find resolution.

3. Because of identification with the larger view, it is often possible for individuals to rise above local, provincial views. This can lead to meaningful change and improvement.

Possible Membership for a COTEP Advisory Council for Teacher Preparation

Number Of Participants	Professional Assignment	Tenure of Appointment
1	Teacher Education Administrator	Permanent Member
1	School-Based Supervisor	Three-year App't
1	Univ Clinical Supervisor	Three-year App't
1	School-Based Administrator	Three-year App't
1	At Large Representative from each Institutional Coop. Council	Three-year App't

* Five representatives from each member school.

It goes without saying that the COTEP Advisory Council for Teacher Education would have no authority to impose standards or to take any action regarding any member school. Its existence and its measure of success are totally advisory. Direction and progress are frequently in need of advice. The COTEP Advisory Council during its quarterly meetings would address significant issues, such as several which have been presented in this report. As a result, recommendations, concerns, suggested actions, and a thoughtful sharing of ideas will be made available to all of the member schools. When seen from a larger perspective, very real concerns often can be seen more clearly. Much as voluntary accrediting associations assist in maintaining quality control, the recommended Council can elevate expectations and professional practice while maintaining strong campus autonomy.

REFERENCES

Abernathy, Sandra et al. (1985). "What Stresses Student Teachers Most." Clearinghouse, 58, 361-2.

Albrecht, James E. (1982). "Of Power, Vultures, and Lab Schools," National Association Of Laboratory Schools Journal, III (2), 1-9.

Applegate, Jane H. (1985). "Early Field Experiences: Recurring Dilemmas," Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (2), 60-64.

Ayers, Jerry B. (1983). "Consistency of Teacher Behavior Across Time," Education, 103 (4), 375-77.

Barr, Robert D. (1984). "Quality Assurance Teacher Education Program," Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (6), 55-56.

Boardman, Sharon and Michael Butler (Eds.) (1981). Competency Assessment in Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, pp. 97.

Bouchard, J., and R. Hull. (1970). "A Pilot Study of Problems and Practices in the Induction of Beginning Teachers," Fredonia, N.Y.: The State University of New York, (ERIC: ED040157).

Bowman, N. (1979). "College Supervision of Student Teaching: A Time to Reconsider," Journal of Teacher Education, 30 (3), 29-30.

Burke, Peter and William Schmidt. (1984). "Entry Year Assistance: A Promising Practice," Action in Teacher Education, 6 (8), 70-74.

Bush, R. (1966). The Formative Years," The Real World of the Beginning Teacher, Washington, D.C.: NEA.

Coker, Homer. (1985). "Consortium for the Improvement of Teacher Evaluation," Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (2), 12-17.

Commission on Teacher Training and Licensing. (1976). Teacher Education and Certification Handbook (TEACH) Rules 46-47. Indianapolis: Indiana State Board of Education, pp. 130.

Cooper, James M. and David Sadker. (1972). "Current Trends in Teacher Education Curriculum," The Journal of Teacher Education, 23 (3), 312-317.

Copenhaver, R. (Ron) W., David M. Byrd, D. John McIntyre, and William R. Norris. (1982). "Synergistic Public School and University Research," Action in Teacher Education, 4 (1), 41-45.

Covert, J. R., and R. A. Clifton. (1983). "Extending the Practicum," Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 29 (4), 297-307.

Creek, Roy J. (1982). "Laboratory School Teachers as Teacher Educators," National Association of Laboratory Schools Journal, 3 (2), 48-51.

Cruickshank, Donald R. (1985). "Applying Research on Teacher Clarity." Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (2), 44-48.

Dennemark, George and N. Nutter. (1980). The Case for Extended Programs of Initial Teacher Preparation. Washington, D.C.: (ERIC: ED 180 995).

Egbert, Robert L. (1985). "The Practice of Preservice Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, (36) 1, 16.

Emans, Robert. (1983). "Implementing the Knowledge Base: Redesigning the Function of Cooperating Teacher and College Supervisors. Journal of Teacher Education, 33-34, 14-16.

Evertsen, C. M., Willis D. Hawley and Marilyn Zlotnik. (1985). "Making a Difference in Educational Quality Through Teacher Education," The Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (3), 2-12.

Gajar, Anna Helen. (1983). "Teaching Behaviors: Reliability of Measurement," Teacher Education and Special Education, 61 (1) 3-6.

Gallegos, Arnold M. (1972). "Teacher Training: The Realities," The Journal of Teacher Education, 23 (1), 43-46.

Garland, Colden. (1982). Guiding Clinical Experiences in Teacher Education. New York: Longman. 203 pages.

Gerwinner, M. N. (1985). "A Study of the Results of the Interaction of Student Teachers and Their Supervising Teachers," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University.

Gilman, Francie. (1984). "Cooperative Ventures in Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (6), 24-26.

Gitlin, Andrew: Rodney T. Ogawal, and Ernest Rose. (1984). "Supervision, Reflection, and Understanding: A Case for Horizontal Evaluation," Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (3), 46-52.

Goodlad, John I. (1984). A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. 396 pages.

Gorton, R. (1973). "Comments on Research: The Beginning Teacher," NASSP Bulletin, 56 (363), 26-30.

Grant, Carl A., and Kenneth M. Zeichner. (1981). "Inservice Support for First Year Teachers: The State of the Scene," Journal of Research and Development in Teacher Education, 14 (2), 99-111.

Griffin, Gary A. (1984). "Crossing the Bridge: The First Year of Teaching," Paper presented to the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education, Austin, Texas, pp. 17.

Griffin, Gary A. (1985). "Teacher Induction: Research Issues," Journal of Teacher Education, 43-47.

Haworth, Shirley. (1985). Phone interview to University of North Carolina-Greensboro. By Ronald R. Crawford, Doctoral Fellow, Ball State University.

Howey, L., and R. Bents. (1980). "A Talk With Beginning Teachers," Toward Meeting the Needs of the Beginning Teacher, Minneapolis: USOE/Teacher Corps.

Howsam, R., D. Corrigan, G. Denemarck and R. Nash. (1976). Educating a Profession, Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Hoy, W. (1968). "The Influence of Experience on the Beginning Teacher," School Review, 76 (3), 312-323.

Huling, Leslie L. and William L. Johnson. (1983). "A Strategy for Helping Teachers Integrate Research into Teaching," Teacher Educator, 19 (2), 11-18.

Husen, Torsten and T. N. Postlethnaite (Eds). (1985). International Encyclopedia of Education (vol. VI). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Iannocrone, L. (1963). "Student Teaching: A Transitional Stage in the Making of a Teacher," Theory into Practice, 12 (2), 73-80.

Johnson, James A. (1968). A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs. Baltimore, MD.: Multi-State Teacher Education Project.

Jones, Alan H. and Carol P. Barnes. (1984). "The California Consortium: A Case Study on Seeking Change in Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (6), 5-10.

Kane, William T. (1935). A History of Education, Chicago: Loyola University Press, p. 282.

Kingen, Sharon. (1984). "Does the Left Hand Really Know What the Right Hand is Doing?" The Teacher Educator, 20 (1), 2-13.

Krause, Loretta D. "The Laboratory School in an R & D Setting," Educational Perspectives, 16, (2) 23-24.

Laguna, J. (1970). What Happens to the Attitudes of Beginning Teachers?, Danville, IL.: Institute Printers.

Lanier, Judith. (1984). "The Preservice Teacher Education Improvement Project: A Critical Review," Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (4), 24.

Meyer, Aldophe E. (1965). An Educational History of the Western World. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

McBee, M., and J. Crawford. (1983). Entry Year Teacher Study Executive Summary, Oklahoma City: Oklahoma Public Schools.

Mills, Johnnie R. (1984). "Addressing the Separate-But-Equal Predicament in Teacher Preparation: A Case Study," Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (6), 18-23.

Milner, Joseph and R. W. Reising. "Classroom Experimentation and Good Teaching: Are They Compatible?" English Journal, 71 (8), 69-71.

Morris, John, Sue K. Parnell and Robert Houston. (1984-85). "Certification of Supervising Teachers," The Teacher Educator, 20 (3), 7-13.

Nicklas, Willis L., Watt L. Black and Richard L. Simms (1982). "Field-Based Teacher Education: Programs That Work," Teacher Educator, 18 (1), 2-9.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (1982). Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: NCATE.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (1981). Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: NCATE.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (1979). Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: NCATE.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (1985). NCATE Redesign. Washington, D.C.: NCATE.

Page, Fred M. Jr. (1982). "The Development of Research as a Role in Laboratory Schools." National Association of Laboratory Schools Journal, 3 (2), 15-19.

Purcell, Thomas D. and Berniece B. Seiferth (1981). "Evaluation of the Student Teaching Experience," College Student Journal, 15 (2), 137-39.

Rolider, Ahmos, Mary McNeil Pierce, Ron Van Houten, Malca Malcho, and Leah Yievitch (1985). "The Effects of a Comprehensive Feedback Component on the Preparation of Preservice Educators," Gifted Child Quarterly, 8, (1) 17-24.

Romberg, Elaine. "A Factor Analysis of Students' Ratings of Clinical Teaching," Journal of Dental Education, 48 (5), 258-262.

Ryan, K., et al. (1980). Biting the Apple: Accounts of First Year Teachers, N.Y.: Longman.

Seiforth, Berniece and Marie Samuel (1979). "The Emergence of Early Field Experiences," The Peabody Journal of Education, 57 (1), 10-16.

Shanker, Albert (1985). "In Support of Teachers: The Making of a Profession," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 69, 93-99.

Silvino, Philip J. and Alan D. Willsey (1977). "An Experiment in Field-Based Teacher Education," Education, 97 (3), 220-224.

Simms, Richard Leslie (1983). "Attitudes of Oklahoma Teachers Toward House Bill 1706," Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (2), pp. 26-28.

Sizer, Theodore R. (1983). "High School Reform: The Need for Engineering," Phi Delta Kappan, 64 (10), 679-683.

Smith, C. Leland and Edgar L. Sagan (1974-75). "A Taxonomy for Planning Field Experiences," The Peabody Journal of Education, 52 (2), 89-96.

Thies-Sprinthall, Lois (1984). "Promoting the Developmental Growth of Supervision Teachers: Theory, Research Programs and Implications," Journal of Teacher Education, 35.

Thompson, Scott (1984). "School College Connection," NASSP Bulletin, 68 (474), 1-17.

Tittle, Carole K. (1974). Student Teaching, Matucken, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press Inc., 220 pages.

Watts, Doyle (1984). "Teacher Educators Should Be Certified", Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (1) 30-33.

Whaley, Charles R. (1984). "Creating Incentives for Cooperating Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (4), 46-49.

Wheeler, Alan H., and Gary D. Ellerman (1982). "A Model for Collaborative Inservice Education," The National Council of States on Inservice Education's Seventh Annual Inservice Conference, Atlanta, Georgia: p. 6, The Council, p. 6.

Willems, Arnold L., Max A. Brown, and Alfred A. Arth (1982). "Of What Value is Pre-Student Teaching Classroom Experience?" College Student Journal, 16 (1), 60-63.

Wilson, Garfield (1983). Domains: Knowledge Base of the Florida Performance Measurement System. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Education, Certification, and Staff Development.

Woodruff, Asahel (1965). "Implications for Institutional Actions." The Association for Student Teaching: Forty-Fourth Yearbook, 1965, Theoretical Bases for Professional Laboratory Experiences. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., Inc. pp. 105-113.

Woolever, Roberta M. (1985). "State Mandated Performance Evaluation of Beginning Teachers: Implications for Teacher Educators," Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (2), 22-25.

Zeichner, K. (1979). "The Student Teaching Experience," Action in Teacher Education, 1, 58-61.

Zimpher, Nancy L. (1985). "Current Trends in Research on University Supervision of Student Teaching," Columbus, Ohio: Unpublished paper, pp. 52.

APPENDIX

Glossary from National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education Redesign Statement

G L O S S A R Y

ACCREDITATION:

A primary means for voluntary self-regulation. Serves as a significant vehicle for assessing and enhancing academic and educational quality. As a condition, NCATE accreditation grants status to an institution which has been found by its professional peers to meet the stated criteria concerning educational quality and accomplishment. As a process, NCATE accreditation determines the quality of professional programs and assists in approving that quality. As an activity, NCATE accreditation brings members of the academic and professional communities together to develop and validate standards, to assess educational programs, and to provide peer judgment and guidance. NCATE accreditation thus assures students and the general public of educational quality and institutional or programmatic integrity.

ADVANCED PROGRAM:

Post-baccalaureate degree courses leading to advanced certification. Graduate credit is commonly awarded. Master's, specialist and doctoral degrees are included as well as non-degree certification programs offered at the graduate level.

BASIC PROGRAM:

A college or university program leading to initial certification. Courses commonly lead to a baccalaureate degree; exceptions may include MAT or other extended programs.

CAMPUS-BASED EXPERIENCES:

Those practicum experiences which are provided on the campus of a higher education institution. Includes simulation activities, learning laboratories, microteaching clinics, demonstration centers, laboratory schools, other technologically related experiences.

CERTIFICATION/LICENSURE:

Terms which are commonly used interchangeably. Relates to official recognition by a state governmental agency that an individual has met mandated requirements and is, therefore, approved to practice as a duly certified/licensed educator.

CLINICAL EXPERIENCES:

Practicum experiences which are characterized by careful planning, stipulated goals, required activities, projected performance levels, and evaluation of growth. Includes microteaching clinics, participation experiences, skill clinics, student teaching, internships. Are conducted both as school-based and campus-based experiences. Activities not meeting the criteria for clinical experiences might

include general observations, voluntary community service, orientation visits, teacher aiding, periodic visitations to educational settings.

CRITERIA FOR COMPLIANCE:

Specific statements which require the presentation of evidence, data, or behaviors that enable the accreditation team to make informed and accurate judgments. Institutions may wish to include additional relevant supporting information and data to describe the unit's efforts to meet standards.

CULTURALLY DIVERSE POPULATION:

Refers to the cultural background of students including attention to ethnicity, religion, socio-economic status, sex, learning styles and cultural expectations which are significant factors in instruction and learning.

DEAN, DIRECTOR, OR CHAIR OF EDUCATION:

For the purposes of NCATE accreditation, the individual designated to represent the teacher education unit. The person delegated the authority and responsibility for the overall administration and operation of the professional education unit would be expected to hold one of these administrative titles.

EARLY PRACTICUM EXPERIENCES:

May be clinical as well as non-clinical. For undergraduate programs, both school-based and campus-based experiences which occur prior to the full-time student teaching assignment. For graduate students, those experiences which may occur prior to an indepth culminating direct experience requirement.

EDUCATION STUDENTS:

Individuals who have elected to pursue programs leading to state certification. Includes those who seek licenses and those who aspire to gain additional advanced professional preparation.

EXCEPTIONAL POPULATIONS:

Students attending school who possess physical, mental, or emotional exceptionalities which may necessitate special consideration by classroom teachers.

FIELD-BASED EXPERIENCES:

Those practicum experiences which are conducted at a school site or at an administrative center, a school clinic, or an appropriate community agency. Planning is shared by the professional education unit and the appropriate agency.

FULL-TIME FACULTY:

Personnel who are employed on a full-time basis by an institution of higher education as professors or academic administrators. Actual load responsibility may vary among several assignments within the institution.

GOVERNANCE:

Addresses designation of responsibility for basic policy development, program initiation, ongoing evaluation, leadership and coordination with other campus units. Includes the maintenance and support of all professional programs including fiscal and personnel matters. Establishes ultimate accountability for the quality of students who are graduated from professional programs.

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT:

A written report prepared by the institution seeking accreditation. A qualitative and quantitative assessment of the professional education unit in which the institution describes the administrative staff, the faculty, and the process for achieving institutional goals and objectives. Also presented in the Institutional Report is a written description of how the professional education unit meets the NCATE Standards and the Criteria for Compliance for each professional education program offered.

PART-TIME FACULTY

Individuals who are employed by an institution of higher education for less than a full load assignment. Such faculty are commonly considered to be temporary and are not eligible for tenure consideration.

PRACTICUM EXPERIENCES:

Opportunities which are provided to allow students to experience actual application of professional skills and knowledge. Included are direct, real experiences and simulated activities. Frequently referred to as Laboratory Experiences, Field Experiences, Clinical Experiences, Student Teaching and Internships.

PRACTITIONER:

An individual who is currently employed as a certified teacher, supervisor, administrator or school service personnel professional.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION (PROFESSIONAL STUDIES):

That portion of the total preparation program which addresses skills and knowledges. Sometimes referred to as Professional Studies. Includes pedagogical, theoretical, and practicum studies designed to prepare education students to work effectively in their professional roles.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT:

The college, school, department or other administrative body within the institution that is officially responsible for the preparation of students who seek state certification as teachers or of other professional education personnel.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS:

Individuals who are engaged in some aspect of the teaching/learning enterprise. Used broadly, the term includes teachers, supervisors, administrators, and school service personnel who hold valid licenses. Also included are professors and, on occasion, teacher aides and practicum/intern students.

SCHOOL-BASED EDUCATORS:

A certified professional practitioner who teaches, administers or otherwise serves students enrolled in elementary, junior high/middle, or secondary schools.

SCHOOL-BASED SUPERVISOR:

A professionally certified practitioner who provides on-site clinical supervision and direction for college/university students during field-based laboratory assignments. Frequently termed cooperating teacher or cooperating supervisor. Must be certified and experienced in the area in which clinical supervision is provided.

STATE APPROVAL:

A governmental activity requiring all professional education programs within a state to meet standards of quality so that their graduates will be eligible for state certification. Also referred to as state approved program procedure.

STUDENT TEACHING:

An indepth, direct clinical laboratory experience conducted in a school setting. Considered a culminating clinical experience for the basic teacher preparation program. NCATE criteria stipulate that the full-time assignment will be for at least ten weeks and that the experience shall be supervised both by a college-based supervisor and by a school-based supervisor.

SUPERVISOR OF CLINICAL AND FIELD-BASED EXPERIENCE:

The college or university faculty member(s) assigned to supervise clinical and field-based experiences for basic and/or advanced programs.

TEACHER EDUCATORS:

Professional practitioners who serve as the training arm of the teaching profession; normally employed by institutions of higher education. In addition to areas of specialization, these faculty demonstrate knowledge of a commitment to general teacher preparation. Includes school-based practitioners who serve as on-site supervisors of practicum students during early experiences and for student teaching.

TERMINAL DEGREE:

The highest level of educational attainment expected for full participation in a given endeavor. For the field of professional education, the Ed.D., the Ph.D., or an equivalent degree in a related area of concentration.

UNIT ACCREDITATION:

A procedure which guarantees that all aspects of the professional education unit are reviewed and evaluated as a basis for determining eligibility for accreditation. It is the total professional education unit which is considered for accreditation, not individual programs offered by the unit. Weaknesses or strengths in any single program may not be of sufficient weight to lead to the denial or to the approval of the entire professional education unit; it is a composite assessment of the unit which shall guide NCATE actions. NCATE does, however, render separate unit accreditation decisions for basic programs and for advanced programs.